REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were present in the application as filed and are currently pending and under consideration.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-14 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwardson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,763,411) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,761,903).

According to the Office Action, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to replace the fibrin monomer coating as disclosed by Edwardson et al. with coating agents as disclosed by Chen et al. in order to provide for a method to prevent scarring. Applicant disagrees.

Edwardson et al. relates to the use of fibrin sealants to stem blood loss. In keeping with the conventional wisdom with respect to fibrin sealants for wound healing, Edwardson et al. teach application of a fibrin composition to promote clotting. Edwardson et al. teach application of the fibrin composition of the invention to the "desired" wound site, that is, "that location where one desires to form the fibrin clot." (col. 17, lines 35-39). This is exactly the opposite of Applicant's goal.

Applicant's claimed method is directed to a method for minimizing scarring and/or preventing excessive scar formation at an injury site. The method comprises applying to the injury site a first aid bandaging material that has been coated with a therapeutically effective amount of a defibrinogenating agent, such as ancrod. It is clear from the specification that fibrinogen and fibrin play key roles in scar formation and that depletion of fibrin is sought as a strategy for minimizing scarring. The claimed method, therefore, requires administration of a defibrinogenating agent to achieve *fibrin depletion* at the wound site, **not** fibrin enhancement as taught by Edwardson.

That ancrod is used to produce the fibrin monomer of the composition disclosed by Edwardson is irrelevant. Ancrod requires a source of fibrinogen to produce fibrin; if the composition of Edwardson attempted to replace fibrin with ancrod (which it doesn't) without including a source of fibrinogen in the same composition, fibrin depletion would be the result with concomitant inhibition of clotting, not fibrin enhancement to promote clotting; this result that would be counter to what Edwardson is trying to achieve. Thus, Edwardson et al. teaches away from the present invention.

Chen et al. relates to drug delivery and in particular a drug delivery composition that enhances solubility of therapeutic agents and forms a clear aqueous dispersion upon mixing with an aqueous medium. Though Chen et al. teaches that in one embodiment, the dosage forms may be processed by techniques selected from a group that includes "coating," there is no teaching or suggestion in Chen et al. regarding the desirability of coating bandage material or sutures with a defibrinogenationg agent, and no teaching or suggestion that administration of defibrinogenating agent to an injury is efficacious for minimizing scarring at the injury site. Thus, Chen et al. is inapposite to the present invention.

The teachings of Chen et al., therefore, do not compensate for the deficiencies of Edwardson et al.

The combined teachings of Edwardson et al. and Chen et al., therefore, do not result in Applicant's claimed method.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Smith Dias
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,707

Dated: April 24, 2007

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579